BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 1 STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 KENNETH HITCHCOCK, 3 PCHB No. 89-152 Appellant, v. FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW SPOKANE COUNTY AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER CONTROL AUTHORITY, 6 Respondent.

This is an appeal of Notice of Violation and Civil Penalty No. 4354 (\$100) for alleged violation of Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority Regulation 1, for an open fire.

A formal hearing was held before the Pollution Control Hearings
Board on February 21, 1990 in Room 104 of the Post Office Building,
Spokane, Washington, before Member Harold S. Zimmerman, Presiding, and
Chair Judith A. Bendor.

Appellant Kenneth Hitchcock appeared and represented himself.

Respondent SCAPCA was represented by Attorney Mary Smith of Miller &

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

•

27 | PCHB No. 89-152

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Wainwright, Cheney, Washington. Court reporter Caryn E. Winters of C.W. Court Reporting recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined and admitted. From testimony, exhibits and contentions of the parties, the Board makes these:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

On October 22, 1989, Keith G. Carpenter, environmental engineer for Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority (SCAPCA) arrived at East 4515 - 29th, Spokane at 7:40 p.m., where there were two open fires. He had seen flames from two miles away. One fire was approximately 40 feet by 20 feet and the other about 20 feet by 20 feet, about 60 feet apart. Both were unattended at the time. Both fires contained prohibited materials, including a tricycle with its tires, an appliance, junk metal, plastics, furniture and rubbish. There was a lot of smoke.

ΙI

Mr. Hitchcock was located at his residence. He did not interrupt his activities to put out the fire or call the fire department, claiming that the fires were now under control.

III

The inspector left and called Fire District 8, which responded at 8:15 p.m. When the firemen arrived, Mr. Hitchcock was trying to put

?6

out the fires with a single garden hose, but his efforts were not effective. The fire department used its entire tank truck load, approximately 800 gallons of water, to control the fires. The fire fighters returned to the fire station at 8:51 p.m. One fire was still smoldering the next day.

IV

SCAPCA sent a Notice of Violation No. 4354 to Mr. Hitchock by certified mail, received on October 31, 1989, assessing a \$100 fine. The Notice alleged violation of open burning laws: SCAPCA Regulation 1, Article VI, Section 6.01, and Chapt. 173-425 WAC.

Mr. Hitchcock filed an appeal with this Board which became PCHP No. 89-152.

V

The Hitchcocks wanted to burn some tree limbs. Mrs. Susan Hitchcock checked with SCAPCA and learned that they were in an area where open burning was allowed.

Mr. Hitchcock set one fire about eight to ten feet away from a rubbish pile, about 100 feet from his house. He did not check to see if the ground was solid. When he thought the fire had burned out, close to 5:00 p.m., he started the second fire. Six to eight feet of ground had been cleared around this fire.

Only one garden hose, with four to five linked sections, was available to control these fires. But the first fire was not out. It

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PCHB No. 89-152

1	went underground and emerged to burn the rubbish and other material.			
2	The second fire also left its immediate area and began burning the			
3	tricycle, appliances, etc. Appellant decided it was best to let the			
4	fires continue to burn, believing they were under control, and he wen			
5	inside for dinner.			
6	VI			
7	Any Conclusion of Law which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereb			
8	adopted as such.			
9	From these Findings of Fact, the Board enters the following:			
10	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
11	I			
12	The Board has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject			
13	matter. Chapters 43.21B and 70.94 RCW.			
٠4	II			
15	The state policy on open burning states:			
16	It is the policy of the state to achieve and maintain			
17	high levels of air quality and to this end to minimize to the greatest extent reasonably possible the burning			
18	of outdoor fires. Consistent with this policy, the legislature declares that such fires should be allowed			
19	only on a limited basis under strict regulation and close control. RCW 70.94.740.			
20				
21	Local air pollution control authorities are authorized to adopt			
22	regulations. RCW 70.94.755.			
23	III			
24	SCAPCA Regulation 1, Article VI, Section 6.01 states in pertinen			
25				
ባዓ	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER			
27	PCHB No. 89-152 (4)			

1 part: 2 EMISSIONS PROHIBITED 3 SECTION 6.01 OPEN FIRES 4 This rule, promulgated under chapter Α. 70.94 RCW, the Washington State Clean Air Act, 5 authorizes the Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority to implement the provisions of 6 that act. [. . .] 7 Prohibited materials. Except as provided in Subsection F, the following materials shall not be 8 burned in any open fire: 9 Garbage; 1. 2. Dead animals; 10 3. Asphaltic products; Waste petroleum products; 11 5. Paints; 6. Rubber products; 12 7. Plastics; Any substance, other than natural vegetation, ٦3 which normally emits dense smoke or obnoxious odors. [WAC 173-425-045 is the same.] 14 $[\ldots]$ 15 Residential Open Burning. 16 No open fire shall be allowed on the premises of 17 any residence: 18 $[\ldots]$ 19 If the fire contains prohibited materials, as given in Subsection D. 20 d. If the fire contains any material other than 21 natural vegetation; or 22 If the fire is larger than a small fire. 23 The premises of a residence include the real property immediately adjacent to the residence 24 25 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER (5) 27 PCHB No. 89-152

1 }	which is owned by the same person who owns the		
2	residence, and which is not devoted to agriculture use, other than yard and gardening activities		
3	connected with the residence. [WAC 173-425-065 is the same.]		
4	2. Single small fires on the premises of a residence		
5	may be allowed to dispose of yard and garden debris if:		
6	 a. None of the provisions of Subsection G.l. are violated; 		
7	[]		
8			
9			
10	c. Such fires are attended at all times by a person capable of extinguishing them;		
11	[]		
12	d. Such fires are [] at an adequate		
13	distance from [] other combustible materials. Fifty (50) feet is the minimum desired		
14	distance separating fires and combustible materials.		
15	g. Burning shall be done between the hours of		
16	9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.		
17	The definition of small fire is: one not more than four feet in		
18	diameter or three feet high. Article I, Section 1.04 NN.		
19	(WAC 173-425-030(10) is the same.)		
20	IV		
21	The Washington Clean Air Act is a strict liability statute. Acts		
22	violating its implementing regulations and the local air pollution		
23	authority regulations are not excused on the basis of absence of		
24	authority regulations are not excused on the basis of absence of		
25			
26	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,		
27	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PCHB No. 89-152 (6)		
•			

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	l
21	1
22	l
23	l
24	
25	
'6	
27	

intent. RCW 70.94.040. <u>Industrial Maintenance and Construction, Inc.</u> v. PSAPCA, PCHB No. 87-179 (1988).

v

We conclude that Appellant Hitchcock has violated Regulation 1, (and parallel provisions in Chapt. 173-425 WAC) at:

- 6.01 D. and G.1.c and d, and G.2. Burning prohibited materials.

 Once Hitchcock started the fires, he was responsible for the consequences of these fires.
 - 6.01 G.l.e. and 1.01 NN Not a small fire.
 - 6.01 G.2. More than one fire was set.
- 6.01 G.2.b. Means of extinguishment were not readily available. The garden hose was inadequate to extinguish.
- 6.01 G.2.c. The fires were not at an adequate distance from combustible materials; not 50 feet from such material.
- 6.01 G.2.g. Burning not done between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The fires continued after 5:00 p.m. The second one was lighted close to 5:00 p.m.

VI

A fine of \$100 was assessed. The maximum civil penalty is \$1,000. Regulation 1, Article II, 2.11.B.1. We conclude that the fine, one-tenth of the maximum, was justified. Mr. Hitchcock demonstrated a cavalier approach to burning. He violated numerous provisions in significant ways. The fine is reasonable to promote

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PCHB No. 89-152

1			
2	future compliance.		
3	VII		
4	Any Finding of Fact which is deemed a Conclusion of Law, is		
5	hereby adopted as such.		
6	From these Conclusions of Law the Board enters this		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
5	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,		
27	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PCHB No. 89-152 (8)		

1		ORDER
2	The Notice of Violation and	civil penalty (\$100) is AFFIRMED
3	DONE thisday of March, 19	990.
4		
5		POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
6		Davel O. mmerman
7		HAROLD S. ZIMMERMAN, Presiding
8		Inder & Bender
9		JUDITH A. BENDOR, Chair
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
`۶	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER	
27	PCHB No. 89-152	(9)